



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES AND ABSTRACTS

Strike Movements for the Month of September, 1906, in Belgium, England, France, and Italy.

I. *Belgium*.—(a) Number and extent of the conflicts: 18 new strikes involving about 2,472 persons directly and 750 indirectly, and 1 lockout in which about 15,000 laborers were involved. In addition, 4 old strikes and one lockout were continued. (b) Chief causes: demand for higher wages in 11 cases, the re-employment of discharged laborers in 3, the discharge of overseers in 2, the reduction of wages and change of labor conditions in 3. (c) Results: There were ended 14 new strikes and 2 old ones, and both lockouts—5 strikes and 1 lockout in favor of, and 10 without results for the laborers; 1 strike and 1 lockout were terminated by an agreement, and in 2 cases all the strikers were discharged.

II. *England*.—(a) Number and extent of the conflicts: There were 23 new conflicts, in which were involved 21,377 laborers. (b) Chief causes: demand for higher wages in 9 cases, other wage questions in 6, questions concerning the employment of special labor classes or persons in 6, questions of labor arrangements in 3, refusal of organized labor to work with unorganized in 1. (c) Results: Seventeen new strikes and 9 old ones were ended—6 in favor of, 10 without favorable results for, the laborers, and 10 by compromise; the number of work-days lost by these conflicts during the month were 147,400.

III. *France*.—(a) Number and extent of the conflict: 82 new conflicts involving 11,265 persons; the average number of conflicts during the month of September for the last five years was 50. (b) Chief causes: demand for higher wages in 41 cases, opposition to a reduction of wages in 3, various other wage questions in 11, questions pertaining to the weekly rest-time in 12, the abolition of piece-work in 2, lessening the hours of labor in 2, concerning the arrangements of labor in 4, demands for the re-employment of discharged laborers in 12, and the discharge of managers in 10. (c) Results: 69 new conflicts and 12 old ones were ended; 18 were successful and 31 unsuccessful for the laborers; in 32 cases there was partial success or compromise.

IV. *Italy*.—(a) Number and extent of the conflicts: 122 new conflicts; in the 95 known cases there were 70,488 persons involved. (b) Chief causes: demand for a raise in wages in 65 cases, opposition to a reduction of wages in 9, shortening of labor time in 2, opposition to the lengthening of the time of labor in 1, various causes in 28, and unknown causes in 11. (c) Results: 99 conflicts were ended; in 23 cases the results were favorable to the laborers, and unfavorable in 22 cases; in 40 cases the laborers were partially successful; in 14 the results were unknown.—“Streikbewegung im Auslande,” *Soziale Rundschau*, November, 1906.

S. N. R.

Conditional Morality.—The occasion of the article is the book *Morality and the Science of Morals*, by M. Levy-Bruhl. The purpose is to clear away some of the confusion attending discussions of the relative or absolute character of morality. I maintain that rational morality is conditional, meaning by “conditional” the opposite of absolute. The precepts of morality must always be accompanied by an “if.” All conscious and reflective activity supposes one or more ends and the means necessary for their accomplishment. A regulative discipline, therefore, of voluntary acts should include two theories: that of obligatory ends, and that of the best means for their attainment. The theory of

obligatory ends, or ideals, may be called *teleology*. The theory of the means may be called *morality*. They constitute two different disciplines. Thus the Christian summary of the law—love of God and love of one's neighbor—is essentially a statement of ideal ends, a direction of the sentiment and the will. But it is not a rule of action, for it does not indicate how I may express my love to God or how I shall procure the good of my neighbor. A morality would prescribe definite acts. Similarly, the categorical imperative of Kant is a statement of an end, but is not a statement of morality properly speaking.

A teleology, while not sufficient in itself, is indispensable. Without it there can be no morality. The latter is an application of a theory of ends to a theory of art. No art in itself has any moral character. It is only in its relation to some particular end that it acquires this. It is here that the author of the book referred to above errs in substituting for morality a rational social art. One might understand social art perfectly and use this knowledge for detestable ends. Certain tyrants have possessed a very high degree of social art. And a scientific sociology, while being the necessary foundation of any effective social art, has in itself no more moral character than an empirical social art. In short, moral conduct rests upon a conception of an ideal, and at the same time upon a knowledge of reality and of effective laws. It is this latter, the means, that is conditional.

Teleological morality, as a theory of the comparative value of good ends considers only possible ends. It rests therefore upon psychology as one of its bases. Psychology points out what ends are possible; teleological morality evaluates these and arranges them into a hierarchy. There are apparent four such possible ends: truth or knowledge for myself, and for others; satisfaction for myself, and for others. There are different sorts of knowledge and different sorts of satisfaction, but we may neglect these differences in our consideration of knowledge in general and satisfaction in general as the ends of life. Either of these may be taken as an end by itself, but to pursue either one alone would be a narrow life. These two ends often come into conflict. In such cases, which shall prevail? Shall I tell the truth at whatever cost, or shall I sometimes sacrifice it for the pleasure or good of someone? Morality supposes a doctrine of the comparative values of these ends in such cases. Moreover, they come into conflict, not only in cases of veracity, but in deciding which shall have the chief part in one's life—the search for truth, and its communication to others, or the seeking for pleasure for others. These questions can be solved only on the basis of a teleology.

But we find that truth and pleasure are abstractions. Concrete reality is made up of the beings who know or are ignorant, who enjoy or suffer. Teleological morality should therefore furnish a theory of the comparative value of the subjects, or of the different values which result from the application of these objects, truth and pleasure, to different subjects. In doing so it must abstract from all differences of situation or circumstances in which individuals are found.

There are other differences of value than those which arise from our personal relations. Different individuals and groups will have different valuations of the same ends. Teleology should give some pronouncement on these differences of judgment. There will be found here four possible theories: (a) Identity of duties. Absolutely the same duties fall upon all individuals. (b) Equality of duties. While duties for different individuals may differ in quality, there is the same measure of good for all individuals. (c) Inequalities of acquirement. The conduct of men increases or decreases their duties. (d) Inequality of nature. People of different faculties have different measures of duty. The science and pleasure of a genius are of greater value than those of an ordinary man.

Though a teleology is necessary, it is not sufficient. It must be applied to reality by a system of rules. In this sense all theories of arts are a part of a complete theory of morality. What I call morality in itself, as distinguished from teleology, is the general theory of the best means in the service of obligatory

ends. This gives rise to such questions as the following: (a) What are the influences that determine our duties, the differences of situation relative to diverse individuals and groups? Teleology neglects differences. Morality gives them a large place. (b) What is the comparative importance of justice and charity in our treatment of people? (c) If charity or beneficence be assigned an important rôle in conduct, what direction should be given it—direct aid or such help as will develop the recipients? (d) Is the ideal of truth better realized by permitting free activity to the talents and energies of people, or by imposing certain limits and uniformities? (e) Is it advantageous for the development of character and talents that the greater part of young people should have the assurance of a patrimony which frees them from the care of daily effort? (f) Is it for the general interest or the contrary that there should be a directing class? With such questions as these, and with practical precepts of conduct, morality is concerned. It can give no absolute answer to any of them; there must always be an "if." For there are many different moralities, depending on the time, conditions, people, and social groups. Under different circumstances the same means will lead to different ends. Thus the moral systems of Christian societies, though excellent, are not immutable. New circumstances give rise to the employment of new means to secure the old ends. Sociology will help men to deceive themselves less often in the choice of means, to take less often the wrong road. It will establish, or at least consolidate, that rational social art of which I at least expect much good, provided it has for its primary foundation a teleological morality.—Adrien Naville, in *Revue philosophique*, December, 1906. C. C. N.

The Moral Aspect of Suicide.—In this article Mr. Gibbons makes the following claims: The reason why there were fewer self-murderers in ancient times than now was because they believed more in a personal responsibility to God than we do; that the suicide is a moral coward; that suicide is a more heinous crime than any other kind of murder; that we owe it to our fellowmen to live; that the only cure for this suicide mania is the application of the principles of the Master. The following brief extracts give the gist of the article:

"In the history of the Hebrew people as recorded in the pages of the Old Testament, and in the history of the primitive Christians as contained in the New Testament, I can recall the names of but five persons who ended their lives by their own hands. . . . The reasons for the rarity of this crime among those worshipers of Jehovah and of Christ are easily explained. Those people were taught that self-murder was a grievous sin, and that man was responsible to God in the life to come for the iniquities done in the flesh. . . . Whatever may be the immediate incentives to suicide, they can be primarily traced to moral cowardice and to absence of religious restraints. . . . I hold that suicide is a more revolting sin than the killing of another. The closer the ties of relationship between the murderer and his victim, the more atrocious is the crime. In the estimation of mankind, a parricide, or matricide, or fratricide, or uxoricide, is a more shocking criminal than an ordinary homicide; and as a man has more intimate relations to himself than to a parent, or brother, or wife, his deliberate self-destruction should excite more horror than the murder of a parent, or brother, or wife. . . . Voluntary self-murder is not only a violation of divine law, but it is also a crime against society. . . . I maintain, then, that a sovereign antidote against suicide is to be found in a strict compliance with the lessons set before us by the religion of Christ."—James Cardinal Gibbons, in the *Century*, January, 1907. W. S. B.

The Truth at the Heart of Capital and Socialism.—Capitalism and socialism are supposed to be direct opposites, and in a very important sense they are: one involves industrial aristocracy and the other demands industrial democracy. But in another and quite fundamental aspect capitalism and socialism are at one, since they both aim at the *organization of industry*. But capitalism wants *organization for private profit*, while socialism wants *organiza-*

tion for the public good. However much we may condemn the plan of organization proposed by socialists, and the means of propaganda and progress adopted or urged by them, we cannot refuse approval of the fundamental *purpose* they have set before us. But though we cannot accept all the capitalists do, nor all the socialists say, we must not close our minds to the great truths for which they stand. If the socialist and capitalist, and the great body of the people who are neither socialists nor capitalists, will look to the care of the matter, recognize the organization of industry as inevitable and desirable, and bend their energies to securing a union that shall contain the maximum of liberty, private initiative, and voluntary co-operation, and the minimum of mastery, in the form of either the individual mastery that prevails in capitalism or the mastery of the majority that would be carried to the limit under socialism, we may escape the dangers of capitalism on the one hand, and of socialism on the other, and attain a *mutualism* that will embody the unity at the heart of both socialism and capitalism, and avoid the evils of both extremes.—Frank Parsons, in *Arena*, January, 1907. J. A. F.

Why I Am a Socialist.—I hate capitalism. Competition in the means of mere existence is war and begets hate; while socialism, co-operation, is peace and begets love. I object that others should profit by or exploit my labor without my consent. The present system of production for profit, and not for consumption, involves untold waste of wealth and labor. Wealth is produced alone by labor, and labor alone is entitled to the product. The present system is one of industrial slavery. I see about me everywhere graft and corruption—municipal, state, and federal. I believe in the collective ownership of the means of production and distribution. The only way to regulate the trusts is to own them. The people should own the government. The capitalist system is destructive of the home and family. Trusts, natural products of society, should be owned and conducted in the interest of society. I am an individualist. Socialism is the only practical and scientific philanthropy. Intemperance is the result of strenuous struggle for existence. The simple life is impossible in this age. The socialist party is the only all-embracing party that deals intelligently with economic cause and effect. I believe in placing measures above men. I am a patriot. I believe the destiny of man is to move onward and upward. The socialist party is the party of the people.—Ellis O. Jones, in *Arena*, January, 1907. J. A. F.

The Economic Advisability of Inaugurating a National Department of Health.—There are four great wastes today, the more lamentable because they are unnecessary. They are preventable death, preventable sickness, preventable conditions of low physical and mental efficiency, and preventable ignorance.

It seems desirable that a United States National Department of Health should be established, having as its head a secretary, who shall be a member of the executive cabinet. The purpose of the department should be to take all measures calculated, in the judgment of experts, to decrease deaths, to decrease sickness, and to increase physical and mental efficiency of citizens. It should consist of the following bureaus:

1. National Bureau of Infant Hygiene: to investigate and regulate conditions causing infant mortality; to educate parents concerning care of the child, food, air, dress, etc.; to establish municipal milk stations, etc.
2. Bureau of Education, Schools and Children's Homes: to co-operate with local schools in (a) medical inspection of children and anthropometric measurements; (b) extension of the New York system of disease examination by permanent nurses; (c) municipal treatment of defective eyes, ears, teeth, and segregation of defective children; (d) inspection of buildings used and methods of schools, children's homes, etc., from sanitary and educational standpoints; (e) systematic education of children in right living along practical lines.
3. National Bureau of Labor Conditions: to investigate and frame legisla-

tion for proper conditions under which labor may be employed, the length of the working-day, hours of rest, etc., which legislation should be enforced.

4. Bureau of Sanitation: to investigate sanitation and ventilation; to establish standards for (a) sewerage systems; (b) water supply; (c) air purity, by regulating smoke and chemical pollution; (d) proportion of building and open spaces in cities; (e) condemnation of unsanitary and overcrowded house property; (f) regulation of dust danger in cities; (g) standards for factories and mines; (h) standards for public halls, theaters, and public conveyances, with inspection; (i) standards of sanitation of farms where dairy products are sold; (j) adequate legislation and inspection to enforce proper regulations and wide dissemination of useful information.

5. Bureau of Pure Food: to provide (a) standards of purity for all foods and drinkables; (b) meat and animal inspection.

6. Bureau of National Quarantine: to (a) provide means for handling epidemics with speed; (b) regulate quarantines against infectious diseases; (c) study and devise means of handling diseases transmitted by insects.

7. Bureau of Registration of Physicians and Surgeons: to have power to require (a) inspection as to curriculum and training of medical colleges and (b) registration of all physicians and surgeons; (c) records of all cases by physicians and surgeons on official blanks showing an analysis by department statistical record such as average visits per illness, cases per death, etc.; returns to be made of all organic or chronic diseases for use of Bureau of Organic Diseases; (d) licenses to be issued barring general practitioners from treating special diseases requiring skill above that evidenced by training; (e) that standard of the profession be raised by protecting the exceptional men and barring quacks, charlatans, etc.

8. Bureau of Registration of Druggists, Drug Stores, and Manufacturers of Drugs: (a) to regulate standard of drugs and to require drugs to be sold, as far as possible, in unbroken packages under seals; (b) to regulate "patent medicines" by requiring contents printed on labels, under government stamp, and severely punishing both newspapers and manufacturers for the insertion of false or fraudulent advertising matter calculated to deceive the public; (c) to regulate preparations of prescriptions by doctor and druggist, by fixing standards, and by summarily punishing substitutions; (d) to maintain competent inspectors and to enforce such regulations as shall accomplish the results; (e) to prepare and to furnish druggists, doctors, etc., with a weekly or monthly bulletin containing orders and instructions in a systematic educational campaign.

9. Bureau of Registration of Institutions of Public and Private Relief, Correction, and Detention: to investigate institutions and establish standards. The inmates should be the subject of experiments in diet, hygiene, sanitation, etc., and also of statistical inquiry.

10. Bureau of Immigration: to include, in addition to present service, provisions for the study of races, desirable immigration, mixture of races, and also distribution locally.

11. Bureau of Organic Diseases: to study returns by physicians, compile notifications concerning chronic and organic diseases, (a) educationally to ameliorate and advise by pamphlets; (b) to follow up and study causes and remedies; (c) to furnish practitioners with directions for treatment.

12. Bureau of Health Information: to disseminate reliable information, couched in plain language, concerning right living as widely and thoroughly as possible.

13. National Bureau of Research Requiring Statistics: Habits should be investigated to a far greater extent than hitherto. The highly exact methods of statistical analysis, involving the theories of variation, correlation, and regression, should be applied to this field on a larger scale. Correlation of food habits and alcoholism with mental and physical efficiency; value of foods experimentally determined by results in connection with mental and physical efficiency rather than laboratory theories; effects of longer or shorter labor day on

efficiency; correlation of the number of open windows and cases of sickness, etc.—such questions of vital interest can be determined to a finality by the new statistical analysis. The preparation of all blanks in use by all other departments should be subject to the approval of this department, which should have at its head exceptional men. The vital statistics of the census should be managed by the bureau.

14. National Bureau of Research requiring laboratories and apparatus: systematically to extend knowledge of remedies for deadly diseases which may be advantageously pursued by laboratory methods.

To equip human machinery, consisting of exceptional men, organized and kept in action for this task, with suitable apparatus and adequate supplies, at least one hundred millions of dollars should be annually appropriated by the nation.

The health department should receive its support (a) from licenses levied on persons and industries inspected, stamp taxes, and registration fees; (b) from national appropriations.—J. Pease Norton. address to American Association for the Advancement of Science, June 30, 1906. V. E. H.

Why Has the Doctrine of Laissez Faire Been Abandoned?—Perhaps the most remarkable change which economic opinion has undergone during the last fifty years has been the change from the extreme laissez-faire doctrine of classical economists to the modern doctrines of government regulation and social control. The abandonment has been gradual and unconscious. Laissez-faire was a natural doctrine when governments were weak. In America government regulation has taken on the form of a struggle with the "interests" for existence. The two fallacies in laissez faire are: (1) The individual, left to himself, does not know what is best for him; society undertakes to teach him what is best. Particular organizations teach certain things; e. g., the Society for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis. The difference between ignorance and knowledge is not a matter of opinion. Objections to imposing a religious creed on a party will not hold against teaching an ignorant class true knowledge as a subject. There is a distinction between what a man desires and what he should desire. A whole range of social betterment is opened up through the distinction. (2) The second fallacy in laissez faire is: A man, when left alone, in selling his individual interest does not thereby best serve the society. The act of one individual in destroying a forest does not thereby best serve society; he may serve himself. Individual action cannot be trusted to provide slow-burning construction in a city building. The government has a right to regulate railroad rates in the interests of the public as opposed to the particular interest. We doubtless today are in danger of too much socialistic experimentation, but the menace of socialism can best be met by understanding the evils it is intended to remedy.—Irving Fisher, in *Science*, January 4, 1907. S. E. W. B.

The Ethics of Corporate Management.—Monopolies are not new; they existed in Asia Minor and Sicily centuries ago; but our industrial methods have changed too fast for our ethics to keep pace with them. Charles Francis Adams, of the Massachusetts Railroad Commission, promulgated some time ago an idea essentially ethical, which was of great service at the time and has been the really vital force in all good schemes of corporate regulation ever since. His central principle was: In the management of a railroad the temporary interests of the road and of its various shippers are often divergent, but the permanent interests of the road and shippers come very much closer together than the temporary ones and can almost be said to coincide. The manager who looks to the future instead of to the present will put the local business on the same charge basis as the through business.

It takes a long time for a man to learn to transfer a principle of morality, which he fully recognizes in one field, to another field of slightly different location and character, particularly if it will injure his personal interests. The obligation of the corporation managers to the public is not yet as clearly recognized as their obligation to the stockholder.

We cannot look to machinery to solve the difficulties of strikes, etc., but to a wider sense of the responsibility on the part of directors and general officers. Subordinates must be selected, not only for their fitness to bring business results, but also for their ability to work with the public. Defiant officials can do more than almost any professional agitator to stir up hatred.

Industrial corporations grew up into power because they met the needs of the past. To stay in power they must meet the needs of the present and arrange their ethics accordingly. If they can do it by their own voluntary development of the sense of trusteeship, that is the simplest and best solution; but if not, one of two things must happen: vastly increased legal regulation, or state ownership of monopolies. Those who fear the effects of increased governmental activity must prove by their acceptance of ethical duties to the public that they are not blind devotees of an industrial past which has ceased to exist, but are preparing to accept the heavier burdens and obligations which the industrial present carries with it.—Arthur T. Hadley, in *North American Review*, January 18, 1907.
S. E. W. B.

The Socialist Movement in England.—The object of this study is (1) to trace the history of English labor organizations; (2) to analyze the new socialistic spirit that has taken the place of their old individualism.

The old unions desired to better the condition of their members by obtaining concession in regard to wages and hours of work, and they had no idea of any transformation of society. International unions of workers in the same trade marked the beginning of the socialistic spirit. The final step was the demand for public power in Parliament. The leaders—John Burns, Tom Mann, Keir Hardie, and others—attempted to turn the movement in the direction of socialism, and thus settle questions the solution of which was necessary, but impossible for private initiative: nationalization of the soil, mines, and means of transportation, old-age pensions, eight-hour day, etc.

The beginning of this movement was in 1893, when the Labor Congress adopted as its policy nationalization of mines and public utilities; from that time the differences between the neo-unionists and the old conservative unionists decreased. Several organizations contributed to this movement: (1) the Democratic Federation, founded in 1881 by Hyndman on the basis of Marxian philosophy; (2) the Independent Labor Party, founded in 1892; (3) the Fabian Society, which was not distinctively a labor organization; (4) the Labor Party, which was an outgrowth of the Independent Labor Party, but which represented in Parliament the laboring class. In 1900 the Labor Representation Committee decided that only members of the unions and men belonging to the Labor Party could represent it at the elections. This was the beginning of their real existence; but not until the January elections of 1906 did the working class depart from its long apparent political indifference; as a result, thirty members were elected to Parliament as representatives of labor. Of these thirty representatives about half are socialists, but the party is not made up, on that account, of two separate contingents. Its members may be socialists individually, but they are collectively and before all else trade-unionists.

This movement in England is only an extension of the political movement of the workmen of the continent, which has destroyed there the equilibrium of the parties and threatens to do the same in England. In its one year of real power it has not favored either the Radicals or the Conservatives, but has worked first of all for the laboring class, then for the general welfare of all England.—Maurice Alfassa, and Henry-Emile Barrault, "Le mouvement socialiste en Angleterre," *Revue politique et parlementaire*, December, 1906.

E. H. S.

Household Budgets or Actual Bookkeeping?—Gottlieb Schapper Arndt, who died a short time ago, was an earnest and conscientious follower of Le Play and spent his whole life gathering household budget statistics; but the vicious method of using a week or a month or even two months as a starting-point and

multiplying the result for a yearly budget, makes his work useless. Contrast the following table, calculated from the actual accounts kept with absolute accuracy for ten years by Karl von K. Taking the 120 months' average as 100, then the expenses are:

January	110.37	July	136.23
February	80.85	August	70.99
March	88.18	September	103.04
April	113.51	October	110.97
May	95.52	November	82.38
June	99.11	December	108.85

Furthermore, comparing three household expenses kept with care, two in Switzerland and one in Germany, we have this result of percentage of expenditures for various needs:

Swiss, 1876-85

	A	B	K. von K., 1896-1905
1. Food	46.3	44.9	31.3
2. Drink (at home).....	1.2	1.4	1.3
3. Household (rent, etc.).....	21.1	22.1	23.1
4. Clothing.....	11.3	9.2	9.8
5. Psychic needs.....	2.5	3.4	2.1
6. Pleasures	7.9	3.7	0.6
7. Cleanliness and care of body.....	2.8	1.9	3.2
8. Sickness and birth expenses.....	1.3	2.3	2.4
9. Foresight (insurance)	1.1	1.1	16.9
10. Taxes	2.6	7.5	2.1
11. Various (gifts, etc.)	1.9	2.5	7.2

Item 3 conceals great variations, such as from 9.8 to 21.7 per cent. for rent in different years.—Karl Bücher, in *Zeitschrift für Staatswissenschaft*, November, 1906. V. E. H.

The Criminaloid.—The real weakness in the moral position of Americans is not their attitude toward the plain criminal, but their attitude toward the quasi-criminal. The prosperous evil-doers that bask undisturbed in popular favor have been careful to shun the familiar types of wickedness. Overlooked in Bible and prayerbook, their obliquities lack the brimstone smell; and so the sight of them does not let loose the flood of wrath that rushes down upon long-attainted sins. The immunity enjoyed by the perpetrators of new sins has brought into being a class for which we coin the term "criminaloid." By this we designate such as prosper by flagitious practices which have not come under the effective ban of public opinion. Relentless pursuit hems in the criminal. The criminaloid, however, fortified by his connections with "legitimate business," may even bestride his community like a Colossus.

The key to the criminaloid is not evil impulse, but moral insensibility. The banker who lends his depositors' money to himself under divers corporate aliases, the railroad official who grants a secret rebate for his private graft, the labor leader who instigates a strike in order to be paid for calling it off—these reveal in their faces nothing of the wolf or vulture. Conscious of the difference between doing wrong and getting it done, he places out his dirty work. He is a buyer and not a practitioner of sin. He invokes a pseudo-Darwinism to sanction the revival of outlawed tactics of struggle. To win the game with the aid of a sleeveful of aces proves one's fitness to survive. The criminaloid is not anti-social by nature. Very likely he keeps his marriage vows, pays his debts, "mixes" well, and has a contracted kind of public spirit. The type is exemplified by Tweed, and other notorious looters, who are "good fellows." They shrink from robbing anybody; are equal, however, to robbing everybody. The criminaloid practices a protective mimicry of the good. He counterfeits the

good citizen. He puts on the whole armor of the good. He stands having his loins girt with religiosity and having the breastplate of respectability. His feet are shod with ostentatious philanthropy, his head is incased in the helmet of spread-eagle patriotism. Holding in one hand the buckler of worldly success, in the other the sword of "influence," he is able to withstand in the evil day and, having done all, to stand. The criminaloid plays the support of his local or special group against the larger society. The criminal can do himself no good by appealing to his group, for they have no social standing. The criminaloid identifies himself with some legitimate group, and when arraigned he calls upon his group to protect its own. The politically influential land-thieves stir up the slumbering local feeling against the "impertinent meddlers" of the land office. The labor grafter resents his exposure as a capitalist plot. The criminaloid flourishes until the growth of morality overtakes the growth of opportunities to prey. It is of little use to bring law abreast of the time, if morality lags. A statute has little force of its own. The backwardness of public opinion nullifies it. Fresh opportunities for illicit gain are ever appearing, and these are eagerly seized by the unscrupulous. The years between these new sins and the recognition of their heinousness are few or many according to the alertness of the social mind. It is in this gap that the criminaloid disports himself. The narrowing of this gap depends chiefly on the videttes that guard the march of humanity. It is the concern of the criminaloid to delay this growth of conscience by silencing these. To intimidate the molders of public opinion so as to confine the editor to the "news," the preacher to the "simple gospel," the educator to his textbooks, and the writer to his classic themes—such are the tactics of the criminaloid.—E. A. Ross, in *Atlantic Monthly*, January, 1907.

The Ethical Problem in an Industrial Community.—The morality which appeals to men with the sanction of the ages is chiefly concerned with the relations of persons who know one another as individuals, or who recognize at least the claims of some mutual bond, whether of kindred or of mere propinquity. Thus the swimmer who refuses to spring into the water to the rescue of a drowning child earns the contempt of his fellows and on reflection probably concurs in the condemnation of his cowardice. But the most numerous and important relations in modern industrial society are to strangers, whom a man does not know, has never seen, and cannot love. It is useless to call such people neighbors. What is needed is to gain a right emotional attitude toward the anonymous crowd. This must be as tough and flexible as the sanctions which the good man respects within the little world of home and acquaintance. Why has a man today any more responsibility to the child struggling in the water before his eyes than he has to the fishermen in their storm-driven boats, struggling to reach the shore that has never been charted, where no lighthouses have been built, no bouys set, no warning bells fixed? It is required to find moral worth in a complex of relationships which seem wholly impersonal. If we shirk the ethical significance of the anonymous relations, the alternative is a species of Macchiavelism. He opposes the interest of the whole universality to that of particular persons, and identifies the whole universality with the personal aggrandizement of the prince.

If a broad distinction be made between town and country dwellers, over three-fourths of the population in Great Britain are living in urban districts—almost exactly the reverse of the conditions existing before the middle of the last century. This massing of peoples has had two results: (1) Normal relations are today between persons who are more unknown, and (2) although more unknown, these persons are more interdependent. The normal relationship, that is to say, is not so much between individuals as between groups. These groups are at once mutually unknown and closely interdependent. Note this in detail in the manufacture and sale of a pair of boots. This problem of our relation to the unknown is intensified by the claim of the known; as, e.g.,

when a mother finds her boy sick with a fever of the type that demands notification of the authorities.

Common life can be organized around an ideal end that is not too remote. A citizen can love his city. It is less easy to see how he can apply his civic enthusiasm to a population mass of forty millions. Yet this must be done. Social morality will disregard and so triumph over the lion form of the anonymous by crystallizing around the idea of justice, not as an abstract conception, but as an immediate and persuasive force. Justice or a love of humanity is a predisposition to love and act rightly toward individuals. How shall this attitude be secured? The inquiry finds its answer in the function of social knowledge and of social imagination.

Sociology has given us the social knowledge necessary to prove that the facts of physical interdependence and economic solidarity involve social responsibility. But the student of sociology deals largely with averages. Now, it is not possible to love an average—at first. But here comes in the function of the social imagination. The power of discerning the common quality of those who pass before our eyes, or who even pass only in the abbreviated sign of figures in a statistical list, is needed to vitalize the knowledge derived from averages. The ethical regard for the anonymous crowd depends equally on statistics and poetry. Statistics reduces all men to the level of averages. Poetry invests these averages in which our own personal acquaintances appear with the attributes of identical personalities. There is a certain advantage in the power of easily transferring the persuasion of human kindred from the familiar face to *x*, the average.

So long as social relations were of the simple personal types the need to discover a representative or symbolic quality in unknown persons was curious or speculative, but with the growth of industrial society the need has become an intensely practical one.—B. Kirkman Gray, in *International Journal of Ethics*, January, 1907. J. K. H.

The Public School and Juvenile Delinquency.—The reform school has received its pupils from the hands of the courts and has administered to them an education of its own devising—an education with many most noteworthy features; and the public school has, when the incorrigible child forced its way (as it seldom did) within its walls, "suspended" or "expelled" him, and has taken little or no note of his subsequent career. Certainly the time has arrived when every education worthy of the time can emphatically stand for the position that it is the business of the public system of education to take account of the educational need of *all* children within the customary school ages. Between the public school on the one hand, and the court on the other, there is at present no place for classes of children fitted for neither.

In two essential respects the reform school will have to borrow from the public-school system—specially trained teachers and improved educational methods. On the other hand, the reform schools have evolved certain educational procedures which will ultimately possess much significance for public-school workers—classification of children according to like capacity and standards, and association of those together who profit best under the same treatment. In other words, segregation in reform schools is for much the same purpose that segregation exists in hospitals; it prevents contagion, but, possibly more important, it permits to each class its most effective treatment. They put the slow cases together and adopt for them the most appropriate treatment. They put together the hardened and the vicious, and then bring to bear upon them the discipline, the training, and the incentives that will cause them to undergo right development. The public school has also much to learn from the reform school in the matter of industrial work.

Every city and town has its wayward children, who, not bad enough for the reform school, are yet, for a variety of reasons, more or less unsuited to the public-school classes as now organized. Within the last few years we have seen the rapid rise of agencies calculated to deal with these children. But what is most needed at present is an integration of these forces, as was stated at the

outset. From the well-regulated classroom in the better school of today, through all the stages of ungraded class, special class, day truant school, juvenile court, probation system, reform school, parole system, and state schools for defectives, we are concerned with the education of children. Child-labor laws are ineffective without compulsory-education laws; and these are really of little avail unless special schools or rooms be provided for the children who do not fit the graded school system. The public school, through its department of supervision, is logically the center about which these various functions should be co-ordinated. Between the parent on the one hand (with the co-operation of his church), and the public school on the other (representing the state in its contribution to the custody and education of children), there should be no middle ground left to the unorganized efforts of charity and voluntary effort, however well-meaning these may be.—David S. Snedden, in *Educational Review*, April, 1907.

J. A. F.

Political economy has learned from the negative criticism and positive doctrine of socialism. In all essential points, German political economy is in general antagonistic to socialism. This is true in an especial manner of the leading academic teachers. Teachers must be free to teach what they believe, else they would lose the personal respect of their students—the necessary element in all teaching.

The socialistic agitation is the result of historic and economic changes, together with the forcing to the front of certain social questions. Scientific socialism is a new economic system, critical and dogmatic in character, whose conscious aim has been to oppose liberalism and individualism, as the latter formerly opposed mercantilism and the benevolent theory of the state. It was a long time before the refusal to accord to socialism and its authors due appreciation disappeared even in academic circles. We have learned from socialism to reinvestigate the economic conditions under the vaunted system of freedom, and also to reinvestigate the principles which underlay public and private law. Political economy came not to be socialistic, but to settle accounts with socialism. Neither socialism nor agitation *made* problems; practical life caused them to *become* problems. German scientific political economy has not surrendered the field to socialism, but rather followed it into the domain of these new problems, becoming neither adherent, nor believer, nor antagonistic, but the critic of socialism, as any older scientific school must be, when it meets a new one and is assailed by it. To the socialistic criticism of the existing system the economists oppose a counter-criticism of the socialistic conclusions and demands. That is the duty of a free science. Such an attitude leads to the recognition of the important scientific work, in spite of fundamental fallacies of socialism. It is a plain duty to add to political economy the correct teachings of socialism. We cannot reject a truth because it happens to come from the socialists. We must concede the truth in all their criticisms, but no more. They go the extreme of denying hero-worship; so they underestimate the influence of a guiding personality, or the entrepreneur. Their general one-sidedness is shown by the depreciation of directive enterprise. The intellectual work of the dogmatic teaching of economic socialism I would be the last to depreciate; yet I am unable to come to any other judgment than this, that the economic and social structure of socialism presupposes, as its material, men not only more perfect, but of an entirely different nature than men have been, are, or will be. The condition which socialism wants would be undesirable.

This will serve to weaken the criticism against German academic economists—that they have not the moral courage to make an open stand for what they know to be logical, i. e., scientific socialism. These economists mediate between economic individualism and socialism, hence antagonisms on all sides. It is the practical duty of statesmen to formulate this compromise from time to time. The theorists can only supply data. Industrial protection and insurance reforms in taxation, etc., show that the German Empire has not lacked practical statesmen, able to read the signs of the times, in economic and social matters.—Adolph Wagner, in *Fortnightly Review*, April, 1907.

S. E. W. B.